

Applicant : Darin D. Tuttle et al.  
Appln. No. : 10/796,649  
Page : 15

### REMARKS

The Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for his efforts with regard to the office action dated August 29, 2006. The Applicant has cancelled claims 8, 10, 15-29, 37-41 and 59-60 without prejudice via this paper. It should be noted that the Applicant reserves the right to pursue the claims subject to a restriction requirement in a future divisional application. The Applicant has added claims 74-106 via this paper. The Applicant has amended claims 1, 11, 30, 42, 52 and 62 via this paper to obtain an early indication of allowance. All claim limitations and claims shall retain a scope consistent with the doctrine of equivalents, with regard to all structure and function, prior to any amendments. Currently, claims 1-7, 9, 11-14, 30-36, 42-58 and 74-106 are pending.

Turning to paragraph 2 of the office action the Examiner has objected to the specification based upon certain formalities. The Applicant respectfully points out that use of "approximately 25 degrees" is the desired language; no sign (or lack of – sign) indicates a positive value in accordance with standard mathematical notation. Additionally, the Applicant has searched the corresponding specification for the dual use of "240f5", the Applicant notes that the only use of this number appears with respect to the spacers. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that these objections to the specification should be removed.

Turning to paragraph 3 of the office action the Examiner has objected to claims 1-14 and 52-73. Once again, the Applicant respectfully submits that no sign (or lack of – sign) indicates a positive value in accordance with standard mathematical notation.

Applicant : Darin D. Tuttle et al.  
Appln. No. : 10/796,649  
Page : 16

Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that these objections to the specification should be removed.

As an initial matter, the Applicant wishes to express appreciation for the early indication of allowable subject matter within claims 8-13, 41-43, 59-64, 70 and 71.

Turning to paragraph 5 the Examiner has rejected claims 1-7, 14, 30, 36, 48, 50-58, 65, 66, 72 and 73 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent 5,371,659, to Pastrick et al. The Applicant respectfully submits that Pastrick et al. does not teach, suggest or provide motivation for an apparatus, comprising: at least one light source for emitting lighting rays, said light source comprising a central optical axis; and an optics block configured to direct substantially all of said light rays to define a horizontal beam pattern directed from approximately 0° to approximately 60° outboard, away, from a controlled vehicle with respect to said central optical axis, said optics block is further configured to direct substantially all of said light rays to define a vertical beam pattern directed from approximately -8° to approximately 10° with respect to said central optical axis, said optics block comprising at least one collimating portion as recited in claim 1 of the present application. In that claims 2-7 and 14 depend from claim 1, the Applicant submits that claims 1-7 and 14 are in condition for allowance in view of the art of record.

Additionally, the Applicant respectfully submits that Pastrick et al. does not teach, suggest or provide motivation for an apparatus, comprising: at least one light source for emitting lighting rays, said light source comprising a central optical axis; and

Applicant : Darin D. Tuttle et al.  
Appin. No. : 10/796,649  
Page : 17

an optics block configured to direct substantially all of said light rays to define a horizontal beam pattern directed from approximately 0° to approximately 60° outboard, away, from a controlled vehicle with respect to said central optical axis, said optics block comprising a first collimating portion, a first deviator portion, a second collimating portion and a second deviator portion as recited in claim 30 of the present application. In that claims 36, 48, 50 and 51 depend from claim 30, the Applicant submits that claims 30, 36, 48, 50 and 51 are in condition for allowance in view of the art of record.

Furthermore, the Applicant respectfully submits that Pastrick et al. does not teach, suggest or provide motivation for an apparatus, comprising: at least one light source for emitting lighting rays, said light source comprising a central optical axis; and an optics block configured to direct substantially all of said light rays to define a vertical beam pattern directed from approximately -8° to approximately 10° with respect to said central optical axis, said optics block comprising at least one collimating portion as recited in claim 52 of the present application. In that claims 53-58, 65, 66, 72 and 73 depend from claim 52, the Applicant submits that claims 52-58, 65, 66, 72 and 73 are in condition for allowance in view of the art of record.

Turning to paragraph 6 the Examiner has rejected claims 1-7, 14, 30, 36, 48, 50-58, 65, 66, 72 and 73 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent 5,788,357, to Muth et al. The Applicant respectfully submits that Muth et al. does not teach, suggest or provide motivation for an apparatus, comprising: at least one light source for emitting lighting rays, said light source comprising a central optical axis; and

Applicant : Darin D. Tuttle et al.  
Appln. No. : 10/796,649  
Page : 18

an optics block configured to direct substantially all of said light rays to define a horizontal beam pattern directed from approximately  $0^{\circ}$  to approximately  $60^{\circ}$  outboard, away, from a controlled vehicle with respect to said central optical axis, said optics block comprising a first collimating portion, a first deviator portion, a second collimating portion and a second deviator portion as recited in claim 30 of the present application. In that claims 36, 40, 44, 48, 50 and 51 depend from claim 30, the Applicant submits that claims 30, 36, 40, 44, 48, 50 and 51 are in condition for allowance in view of the art of record.

Turning to paragraph 7 the Examiner has rejected claims 52, 54, 55, 66 and 72 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent 1,518,787, to Hall. The Applicant respectfully submits that Hall does not teach, suggest or provide motivation for an apparatus, comprising: at least one light source for emitting lighting rays, said light source comprising a central optical axis; and an optics block configured to direct substantially all of said light rays to define a vertical beam pattern directed from approximately  $-8^{\circ}$  to approximately  $10^{\circ}$  with respect to said central optical axis, said optics block comprising at least one collimating portion as recited in claim 52 of the present application. In that claims 54, 55, 66 and 72 depend from claim 52, the Applicant submits that claims 52, 54, 55, 66 and 72 are in condition for allowance in view of the art of record.

Applicant : Darin D. Tuttle et al.  
Appln. No. : 10/796,649  
Page : 19

The Applicant submits that no new subject matter has been added via this amendment. The Applicant further submits that claims 1-7, 9, 11-14, 30-36, 42-58 and 74-106 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicant requests that a notice of allowance be issued. Please call the undersigned should any questions or concerns arise.

Respectfully submitted,  
DARIN D. TUTTLE ET AL.  
By: Gentex Corporation

Oct. 2, 2006  
Date

James E. Shultz Jr.  
James E. Shultz Jr.  
Registration No. 50,511  
600 N. Centennial Street  
Zeeland, Michigan 49464  
616/772-1800